SUBJECTS.

In regard to the first point, he recapitulated the observations he had recorded in the memorandum he had prepared and invited the attention of Government to the detailed exposition therein.

On the second point, he observed that sections 46, 61 and 62 of the Bill were unsuited to the conditions of the country. Technically viewed, a ryot could be prosecuted and evicted summarily from his holding for converting a *punja* land into a cocoanut plantation in the period between one Settlement and another.

In regard to the third point he said that coercive process should be confined only to the recovery of the particular instalment in arrear and that it would be hard and unjust to issue processes for the payment of instalments of tax that had not become due.

His fourth request was that the person of the defaulter should not be made liable to arrest and imprisonment for tax due on his land. The land must be made liable for the tax payable on it and not the pattadar personally, as the revenue was not personal.

The fifth and the last request referred to the limitation of the powers of the Civil Courts. He observed that the decisions of the Revenue officers should be open to the scrutiny of the Judicial tribunals and should not be made final as proposed in the Bill, except in regard to the rate and amount of taxation.

Dewan's reply.—It may be premature to express any opinion on the measure now before the Legislative Council. But, as so much misconception seems to prevail with regard to certain provisions of the Bill, it is necessary that the public mind should be set at ease in respect of one or two points. The Bill refers to Land Revenue officers and the administration of the Land Revenue and it is not intended to interfere with the existing tenures and the present system of land-holding in the country. As regards these tenures and the relation between the landlord and the tenant, it will be the policy of Government to adhere to the existing Proclamations and laws. Further, during the currency of the Settlement, the landholder will be at perfect liberty to do what he pleases with his land and it is not intended to interfere in any way with his right to do so.

17. 'Chatham' a cess not Rajabhogam.

Mr. M. Madhavan Tampi (Member, Kalkulam Taluk) said that the conversion of the *chatham* cess of three chuckrams per cottah of land into a Rajabhogam of one-eighth of the total assessment was contrary to the Royal Proclamation and prejudicial to the interests of the public. It was not known, he said, when and how the cess first

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

SUBJECTS.

came to be levied. He explained the various versions of its origin and said that none of them connected the cess with Rajabhogam. The fact that the cess was levied on all properties, even on *Pandarapattom* lands, showed further that it was not allied to Rajabhogam, but that it was an extra or *piravagai* cess. In these circumstances, he requested that the cess might not be treated as Rajabhogam and converted into one-eighth of the assessment at the Settlement.

Mr. Raman Tampi (Member, Eraniel Taluk) spoke in support of the request.

Dewan's reply.—Noted. The matter will be enquired into.

[*Note*.—It has since been decided that *chatham* should be treated as an extra cess and not as Rajabhogam in the Taluks of Kalkulam and Eraniel.]

18. Improvement and conservation of Irrigation works.

Mr. Padmanabha Pillai (Member, Eraniel Taluk) spoke on the necessity for improving the irrigation tanks. In the Eraniel Taluk alone, he said there were over 900 tanks, but they had in course of time silted up owing to want of timely repairs; and the water that might collect in them during the rainy season was hardly sufficient even for one crop. He requested that the tanks might be conserved and the channels, culverts and bridges connected with them might be maintained in good condition.

Mr. K. Appadura Aiyer (Member, Nedumangad Taluk) urged the necessity for an organized system of irrigation.

19. Abolition of Adiyara for Adoption.

Dewan's reply.—Will be noted for consideration.

Mr. M. Madhavan Tampi also requested that the practice of levying *Adiyara* in cases of adoption in Marumakkathayom families might be abolished. The levy of the fee pressed hard on the people, while it did not bring any large income to the Sirkar. He observed that the enquiry in regard to the valuation of properties for fixing the *Adiyara* gave much scope for abuse. After all, when the property was valued, the *Adiyara* determined and the matter laid before His Highness the Maha Rajah, His Highness, out of kindness, often commanded the remission of the *Adiyara*. As a matter of fact, the *Adiyara* was realised in very few cases. In the course of ten years, there were 23 adoptions and the fee realised did not come to Rs. 2,000. He then referred to the Royal Proclamation of 1063 M. E. which abolished the *Adiyara* in cases of inheritance of the property of *Koottukars* dying without direct heirs and prayed for an extension of the principle embodied therein. He urged that the levying of the fee alone should be stopped, but that the privilege of receiving the *Neet* of adoption should be continued.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly